DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 457 CS 509 292

AUTHOR Chow, Clement; And Others
TITLE Gaining on the Goals? Affirmative Action Policies, Practices, and Outcomes in Media Communication Education.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Broadcast Education Association (41st, Las Vegas, NV, April 12-15, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affirmative Action; College Faculty; *Departments; *Employment Practices; Faculty Integration; *Females; Higher Education; *Mass Media; Minority Groups; National Surveys; Occupational Surveys; *Personnel Policy; Personnel Selection
IDENTIFIERS Diversity (Faculty)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated hiring practices of departments of media communication. Questions were asked about the current distribution of ethnic minorities and women in media communication departments; what policies guide affirmative-action in hiring in the field; whether actual minorities and women hires accurately represent efforts to hire; and what can be done to improve ethnic and gender diversity in the field. The study surveyed 226 department chairs of media communication on their experiences in affirmative action in the hiring of fulltime, tenure-track faculty members in the past 3 academic years. The response rate was 51%. Telephone interviews were conducted with 13 non-responding schools. Some key results indicate: there is a substantial and growing pool of women job candidates; contrary to claims that small schools are unable to compete in hiring, the distribution of minority and women faculty by institution size suggests that colleges and universities of all sizes are finding ethnic minorities and women to hire; the biggest reasons why departments have been successful in hiring ethnic women and minorities are a perceived need for women and minority faculty and the absence of racist and sexist attitudes in the faculty; all schools get minority and women applicants, and all schools get roughly the same percentage of acceptance of their offers to ethnic minorities and women. Successes were found where the faculty stand together on the issue of diversity and actively undertake affirmative action on their own behalf. (Contains 7 tables of data and 39 references. Appendixes contain a cover letter, questionnaire, and interview form.) (Author/SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 397 457

Gaining on the Goals?

Affirmative Action Policies, Practices, and Outcomes in Media Communication Education

by

Clement Chow
Newberry College

Susan Tyler Eastman
Indiana University

Elizabeth Leebron
Temple University

Shu-Ling C. Everett
University of Colorado

Jannette Dates
Howard University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Chow

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS509292

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gaining on the Goals?

Affirmative Action Policies, Practices, and Outcomes in Media Communication Education

by

Clement Chow
Newberry College

Susan Tyler Eastman
Indiana University

Elizabeth Leebron
Temple University

Shu-Ling C. Everett
University of Colorado

Jannette Dates
Howard University

Broadcast Education Association
Las Vegas, Nevada

April 1996

This paper reports the findings of a national survey of schools offering degrees in the media communication field. The paper also incorporates interviews with sample of survey respondents and non-respondents. Nearly all the schools surveyed are present or former members of the Broadcast Education Association.

The study was sponsored by the Research Division, the News Division, the Gender Issues Division, and the Multicultural Division of the Broadcast Education Association. The BEA office provided mailing and faxing assistance, and the Telecommunications Department at Indiana University furnished office and duplication support for this report. Arthur E. Lizie assisted with telephone interviewing, and Gregory D. Newton assisted with data analysis.

Gaining on the Goals?

Affirmative Action Policies, Practices, and Outcomes in Media Communication Education

Affirmative action has become an increasingly controversial issue in hiring for the television business. As far back as 1968, the Kerner Commission roundly criticized the media for their stereotypical portrayals and inadequate hiring of ethnic minorities. Last year, Professor James A. Rada (1995) investigated results of recent efforts in the media industry to address its minority hiring and promotion situation and judged them to be inadequate, especially in the upper-four positions of officials and managers, professionals, technicians, and sales workers. In the media business, women account for 32.8 percent, and ethnic minorities occupy just 16.1 percent of these upper positions.[1]

It would seem reasonable to look at institutions of higher education which prepare the media professionals and examine their records in representation of ethnic minorities and women in media communication, both in their faculty and the student populations, in order to learn what models and values drive them. Rodney J. Reed (1986) pointed to the appalling record of higher education institutions during the early 1980s not only in the hiring of underrepresented minority and women faculty, but also in the disheartening decline of the proportion of students from these groups enrolling in and completing college and university undergraduate and graduate programs. Figures on the social/ethical mix of current undergraduate students are not readily accessible, but it is generally the case that female undergraduates outnumber male undergraduates. Statistics published by the U.S. Department of Education on doctoral degree graduates in communication (covering all branches of the communication disciplines including media communication) showed that of the total of 252 doctoral degrees awarded in communication in 1991-92, about 33 percent went to white males, 48 percent went to white females, 7 percent went to African-American men and women, and 2 percent went to Hispanic men and women. There are few available statistics on faculty composition in media communication education. One accrediting body, the Accrediting Council on Education in

Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC) which has 92 affiliated programs in media communication education, reported that 11 percent of the total student population in accredited schools in 1986-88 were minority and 62 percent were female. Faculties for schools accredited during 1988 were 8 percent minority and 26 percent female (Morton, 1993).

Professor Stephanie L. Witt (1990) undertook a general study of the role of affirmative action in the lives of a national sample of university faculty. At the macro issue level, she looked at the role of affirmative action in a liberal society, and at the micro issue level, examined self-interest in the liberal academic tradition in relation to affirmative action. Witt concluded that white male academics (as opposed to black and women academics) choose as their primary goal the preservation of procedural safeguards for individuals within merit systems, while black and women academics choose as their primary goal increasing the number of women and ethnic minorities in academia. She presumed that the discrepancies in the perceptions of the various categorical groups in her study with regard to affirmative action reflected a divergence over the proper language and value to be emphasized. Witt also recommended that further research be conducted in two primary directions: the tracking of the hiring and promotional decisions made by American universities, and the collecting of more qualitative information regarding public and academic perceptions of affirmative action. She further advocated that intensive interviews be used to ascertain the extent to which various values and decision rules are employed by faculty involved in collegial hiring decisions. Responding to these recommendations, this study follows up Witt's analysis by tracking the separate steps in the academic hiring process -- interviews, offers and successful hires of minorities and women--and makes use of personal interviews to further assess faculty values and decision rules in the media field.

The Current Situation in Media Education

The need for multiculturalism in media communication education has not escaped the notice of broadcast educators (Ziegler, 1991, and Dates, 1991). Furthermore, the most recent three annual reports from the Gender Issues Division of the Broadcast Education Association presented a less than optimistic picture of the representation of women in this professional association (Eastman & Leebron, 1992, 1993, 1994, and Leebron & Eastman, 1995). While authors Eastman and Leebron found that women faculty members have achieved recognition by winning paper competitions and

have improved in their participation in invited panels over the last decade, their representation in the association's leadership positions has been consistently low.

The Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) has recognized the underrepresentation of women and ethnic minorities in its member institutions. In 1990, AEJMC created a Commission on the Status of Women and a Commission on the Status of Minorities (Rush, 1993). Its affiliated accrediting agency, the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC), has included "Standard 12" beginning with its 1990-91 guidelines for accreditation, that established the requirement that academic institutions have minority and female representation plans to become accredited or reaccredited. Standard 12 states that "Units must present written plans of their own on which to base their efforts to recruit, retain, and advance women and minorities into unit faculty ranks and minorities into unit student bodies" (Morton, 1993). While the Broadcast Education Association (BEA) is not involved in accrediting its member institutions, information on the existence, operations, and success of such representation plans are important indicators of the state of these institutions.

Another issue is how schools define the term "minority," which varies from school to school and over time. In a 1995 telephone interview with Shirley Boardman, Director of Affirmative Action at Indiana University (August 16), it was learned that definitions of minority are reworked, to some degree, each time the nation conducts a census. Typically, the definition of minority group contains the five categories of African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans. In some places, "Blacks" may exclude African nationals, "Hispanics" may mean only Hispanic-Americans, and "Asians" may mean only Asian-Americans. In other locations, a minority may be a foreign-national (such as a Kenyan, Costa Rican, or Korean). The definition may specifically include Eastern Europeans. It may include Alaskan Natives as a separate category. In recent years, disabled people and Vietnam veterans have been added to some lists of "protected groups," and at some colleges and universities, sexual orientation, age, and other variables are considered affirmatively. The concept of "protected group" is often raised in discussions of affirmative action plans to reach beyond the largest racial/ethnic minorities in America to cover minor ethnic minorities, women, persons with disabilities, and Vietnam-era veterans (Barbarita, 1982).

Some institutions of higher education, though, have adopted their own definitions of protected groups, in practice if not in official statements. For example, Ohio State University focuses almost

exclusively on African-Americans while Indiana University has a special plan for "Minority Enhancement" which concentrates on African-Americans and Hispanics. And, of course, schools can "double count" African-American and Hispanic women when interviewed, so they are in much demand.[2]

Affirmative Action's Background

The history of affirmative action was traced by Velma A. Adams (1973) to the 1972 amendments to existing federal laws and regulation.[3] Under the Department of Labor's Revised Order No. 4 of Executive Order 11246, each private institution must develop and maintain a written affirmative action program which includes an analysis of the institution's work force and employment practices and an outline of steps the institution plans to take to improve recruitment, hiring and promotion of minority persons and women within 120 days of receipt of a federal contract. Public institutions are advised to develop similar plans. Adams predicted a number of semantic misunderstandings regarding the intent of the order, including whether to set quotas, whether to give preferential treatment to women and minorities, whether to lower standards and fire or admit underqualified applicants, and whether to ignore merit and seniority. In her estimation, none of these represent Congress's regulatory intent.

In its 1975 report, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education predicted that implementation of affirmative action plans would not be easy or painless, and it lamented the opportunities lost during the 1960s when faculty ranks were doubled. The report foresaw a slight down turn in the 1980s in faculty ranks, thus causing more individual disappointments and greater accompanying controversy regarding affirmation action. However, it could not forecast the political shift away from support of affirmative action that took place in the Reagan years (Rubin, Whaley, Mitchell & Sharp, 1984, and Olivas, 1993) and resurfaced again in 1995 (Jaschik, 1995).

In addition to shrinking faculties, the total number of American citizens earning doctorates took a major downturn between 1980 and 1986 (from 26,394 to 22,984 according to Blackwell, 1988). While white Americans maintained their 89.3 percent share, black Americans suffered the most conspicuous loss: from 4.1 percent in 1980 to 3.5 percent in 1986 or just 275 black doctorates. Though Hispanic-American doctorates experienced an increase (from 0.67 percent in 1980 to 1.39 percent), the ethnic minority population of the country experienced less than 50 percent parity in the

total number of doctorates awarded to American citizens each year. Blackwell further pointed out that underproduction of doctorates among minority groups generates especially troublesome problems. He cited the example of strikingly uneven concentrations of degree attainment. In 1986, approximately half of all blacks with doctorates earned them in education, while the white population had only 20 percent majoring in education.

As in many other disciplines such as computer science and engineering, one of the reasons that ethnic minorities and women with doctorates are underrepresented in academic media communication may be the lure of higher salaries and greater personal rewards from entering the media industries or business world with a Ph.D. (see Jones, 1995, and Custred, 1995). Another reason often mentioned is that the professional world is so attractive that many new graduates with bachelors or masters degrees go directly to work rather than go on to undertake the doctoral-degree studies essential for the academic life. However, Rada (1995) in his study on minority underrepresentation in media management, reiterates the Kerner Commission's (1968) criticisms of the situation and reports little progress in industry minority percentages since then, despite two decades of Equal Opportunity requirements for station licenses.

Research Issues

Affirmative action has come under renewed attack as resource scarcity made it a viable political tool in the 1990s (Mercer, 1994, and Jaschik, 1995). Jones (1995) points to the scarcity of employment opportunities and access to higher education for all Americans in an economy squeezed by global competition, and maintains that "Wedge politics, scapegoating, and the politics of scarcity go hand in hand" (p. 13). Jones argues that driving segments of society apart and blaming them for society's problems--in the current case, unemployment--has been a common political device throughout history and results in easy justifications for unequal treatment of ethnic minorities in the current atmosphere of mistrust.

Moreover, affirmative action also brings unwanted public attention to prestigious institutions when their efforts in this area fail to bring on notable changes. One case in point was Duke University which received sharp criticism from its black students and faculty members for what they saw as the university's failure to meet its goals (Applebome, 1993). Rubin, Whaley, Mitchell and Sharp (1984) cited two distinct concepts that have emerged from past legislative and executive orders

taken in the name of civil rights and affirmative action. The first was a mandate by the federal government to "bar discrimination against individuals on the basis of their race, religion, sex, physical condition, national origin, and other such characteristics." The second was the rationale of parity that first emerged during the Nixon and Carter administrations. This second concept gave rise to affirmative action plans (with goals, time tables, and demographic representation of ethnic minorities and women in the work force). Citing the challenging attitude of the Reagan administration towards affirmative action, Rubin et al. recommended that proponents of affirmative action reframe their role from one of description to one of advocacy. *Therefore, this study estimated the degree of advocacy (or active effort) schools utilized in their self-reported affirmative-action endeavors as a way of measuring the sincerity of affirmative-action concern.*

Milem and Astin (1993) conducted a study on the changing composition of the faculty in general between the years 1972 and 1989. They found that in 1989, a much larger percentage (39) of women faculty were newly hired, as opposed to the percentage of previously hired women faculty (24). Back in 1972, the figures had been 24 percent new women and 11 percent previously hired women, demonstrating a marked improvement from 1972 to 1989. However, percentages of minority faculty hired in 1972 and in 1989 show negligible differences. Milem and Astin concluded that while women had gains in their representation in the late 1980s, minority gains were minimal. And even with these gains, women were still underrepresented in academia. The same remained true when Milem and Astin examined the faculty ranks for the different ethnic/racial groups. Unlike women, the minority groups, except for Asian-Americans, had very few gains in the faculty ranks over the 17-year period. They concluded that women faculty members do not always enjoy treatment comparable to their male counterparts. Studies have shown women experience harsher evaluation by their students (Basow & Silberg, 1987); they are generally less well paid (Bellas & Reskin, 1994); they meet resistance when they wish to have their perspectives included in the curriculum (Ryan, 1993); and in the end, they also meet more obstacles when they apply for promotion in the academic ranks (Billard, 1993). *Therefore, this study collected data on both the hiring of women and the hiring of ethnic minorities, whether male or female.*

A commonly cited objection by opponents of affirmative action plans is that a plan represents preferential treatment (Ryan & Martinson, 1996). Arneson (1993) addressed this objection by questioning whether there exist any clear, unambiguous, reasonable standards of qualification for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

university professors. Arneson further pointed out that hiring and promotion standards are heavily distorted by the prejudices and cultural presumptions of the white males who traditionally define these standards. This argument casts doubts on the quality of the "best qualified" candidates selected according to these same standards. Eloquent detractors of affirmative action (D'Souza, 1991) attack the principle of the undesirability of racial and gender underrepresentation and point to specific examples where extreme cases would cause one to doubt the wisdom and justice of an affirmative action plan. As a result, a number of circumvention techniques have been devised to subvert affirmative action in faculty hiring (Blackwell, 1988). These techniques and strategies include the absence of clearly defined job descriptions in advertisements, advertising for teaching and research specialties that are not traditional for minorities, transmitting negative signals during the interview process, and having no ethnic minorities on search committees to review the curriculum vitae of applicants. *In consequence, this study looked into the composition of search committees and investigated whether ethnic minorities and women are typically included on such committees. It also asks departmental chairs to describe their particular problems.*

On the other hand, Collins and Johnson (1988) identified successful cases of gender/ethnic/racial diversification of colleges and universities pointing to the means whereby affirmative action plans can operate to the benefit of most institutions. In the case of Eastern Michigan University, for example, an institutional plan to increase the hiring and promotion of minority faculty members showed definite results. According to Collins and Johnson, plans like Eastern Michigan's required the whole-hearted, public support of opinion leaders and policy makers, and university presidents and board members must be vocally committed to minority participation on their campuses. Moody (1988) also cited strong institutional commitment as an important factor for success. For Reed (1986), the fate of affirmative action plans depends on the moral as well as on the educational will of the institution of higher education to assist in solving the problem of underrepresentation of human resources in this country. To further clarify the role of institution philosophy and implementation, *this study also looked into the functioning of institutional policy regarding affirmative action in schools with media departments, and asked departmental chairs to account for their hiring failures and successes.*

Leslie P. Francis (1993) used a model that divided affirmative action efforts into process-based and outcome-based to identify types of discrimination. To remedy underrepresentation, Francis

suggested that process-directed strategies lead to changes in hiring practices, whereas outcome-directed strategies demand a concrete result (such as a certain percentage of new appointments or an overall percentage of employees in the work force). Francis asserted that under Title VII, process-directed strategies are preferable, but outcome-directed strategies may be used to correct long standing process-based discrimination. Typical forms of process in faculty recruitment included public job advertisements, letters urging applicants from ethnic minorities and women, and special efforts to identify and interview minority and women candidates. In more aggressive cases, there may be administrative pressure on departments to appoint minorities or women, special funding support for affirmative-action appointments, and insistence on filling positions by affirmative-action candidates. Borrowing Francis's distinction, *this study sought to determine what process-based and outcome-based strategies were being utilized by media departments and which had been effective and not effective.*

Rodney J. Reed (1983) saw affirmative-action as a set of positive steps designed to eradicate discrimination by ensuring that the individuals in question are actively sought, encouraged, and given opportunities to become affiliated with those institutions at every level of employment. Therefore, rather than depending solely on hiring outcomes, this study looked particularly at the initial choice of who to interview and asked about recruiting efforts. *Hence, this study also explored who was extended offers and the results of the entire hiring process for each academic position.*

Research Questions

The following list summarizes the main research questions. Because school size has been shown to interact with gender distribution (Eastman & Leebron, 1993, 1994, Leebron & Eastman, 1995), when appropriate, it was used as an independent variable.

1. *What is the current distribution of ethnic minorities and women as faculty in departments in our field?* How does the field's ethnic and gender diversity compare to the national picture? Are there differences by size of program, geographic area, other variables?
2. *What policies guide affirmative-action in academic hiring in our field?* Which schools have guidelines and to what degree is their enforcement monitored? Who in departments makes initial recommendations on interviewing?

3. *Do actual minority and women hires accurately represent efforts to hire?* How do interviews compare to offers? How do offers compare to acceptances?
4. *What can be done to improve ethnic and gender diversity in our field?* What do chairs see as the problems and possible solutions? What practices do departmental chairs see as particularly helpful?

Method

Two methods of nation-wide data-gathering at universities and colleges were utilized. First, chairs of 226 media departments were surveyed by mail in the fall of 1995.[4] Departments included all 4-year and 2-year BEA-member institutions, as identified by the Association office (updating the most recent *BEA Membership Directory*), and former members of BEA (as well as some other institutions teaching media communications) who had listings in Barry Sapolski's *Directory of Media Programs in North American Universities and Colleges* (1994), published by the Association.[5] An explanation of some of the study's main purposes was included in a cover letter to encourage informed responses (see Appendix A). Comparisons of listings for departmental chairs in the two directories (with inconsistencies resolved when possible through telephone calls) helped determine the right person to address the questionnaire to (they were not just sent to "Chair," but to some administrator identified by name). To gain responses from as many schools as possible, nonresponding schools were contacted by telephone (when accurate telephone numbers could be obtained[6]) in a first (September) and second wave (October), and forwarded second (or even third) copies of the survey questionnaire by mail or by fax from the BEA Office.

Second, the researchers completed 13 telephone interviews with chairs of randomly-selected media departments from a stratified sample of 40 nonresponding colleges and universities. The sample represented the four major geographical areas of the U.S. (East, West, South, Midwest) and three sizes of institutions (very large and large were collapsed, plus midsized and small). These interviews served two purposes: When the identical questions were asked on both the mailed survey and telephone interview, the answers could be compared; when the questions varied, the interview answers supplemented our interpretation of the mail survey results. An initial phone call was placed to the 40 institutions to locate the right name for the current chair, to learn whether he or she would be willing to participate, and to set a date/time for an interview.

Because a quadripartite split of departments by numbers of majors (in the main survey) was not highly correlated with school size, and neither was the number of faculty, both variables--number of majors and size of faculty--were used in selected subsets analyses. Since the survey produced only nominal data (in addition to qualitative comments), and only tradition and common sense dictated such independent variables as school size, some analyses were conducted using the other variables to see if they were revealing.

Questionnaire Items

The 4-page mail survey questionnaire (see Appendix A) asked whether the university/college and/or department had written affirmative-action guidelines and, using 7-point semantic differential scales with appropriate end-categories, asked how closely adherence was monitored, how much attention the departmental faculty paid to written or unwritten guidelines, and how the chair rated the college or university and the department on its commitment to hiring minority or women faculty. Responses to the next series of questions provided quantitative information on the minority and gender distribution of job candidates considered, interviewed, and hired in the academic years 1992-93, 1993-94, and 1994-95. For each full-time, tenure-track hire in the last three years, chairs were asked to record whether the pool of serious candidates included ethnic minorities (defined here as African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, or others), whether it included women (and whether any were also minorities), how many candidates were interviewed, whether any of these were minorities or women or both, how many offers went to minorities or women, and whether the offers were accepted.

From a presupplied list of 11 items gathered from the literature (plus an open-ended "other"), chairs were asked to indicate and rank order their departments' top five problems relating to affirmative action (from "highest importance = 5" to "lowest importance = 1"). Using similar ranking and repeating the 11 (plus "other") response items, chairs were then asked for their five reasons for any affirmative-action successes. Next, the chairs were asked to quantify the minority/gender mix in their departments and to report on the size of the total departmental (unit) faculty. In open-ended questions, chairs were asked to define "minority" as the term was being presently used in their colleges and universities, and to describe any other faculty by ethnicity/gender that distinctively contributed to the diversity of their faculties. In addition, we were interested in who makes

departmental recommendations on which applicants to interview, prior to any faculty vote. Chairs were asked if the chair, a tenure/personnel committee, a special hiring committee, or "other" made such recommendations and whether any committee was elected or appointed and what its current ethnicity/gender composition is. Finally, after some demographic items on school and department size, we asked for additional comments. The surveys were analyzed using crosstabulations and Chi Square.

Interview Schedule

For the telephone interviews, the 4-page mail survey was edited to 21 questions suited to oral delivery that took just 10-12 minutes to administer. For example, the position-by-position portion of Question #5 on past hiring was dropped in favor of a summary number, and the rank-order question on "reasons for successes" was dropped. Variant forms of the written questions were created by such means as reducing the request for the "top five problems" to a request for "the single most important problem." Two additional questions were inserted. In an attempt to account for nonresponses in the mail survey, the first added interview question was, "Did you hesitate to respond because you did not have access to the information requested?" Later in the interview, an added question was posed to gauge each chair's level of satisfaction with the local status quo, using the format, "Are you satisfied with your department's achievements in hiring women and minorities?" Consistency was maintained by having one researcher make all calls, track all responses, and tabulate the data collected. Appendix B contains the telephone interview schedule.

Affirmative action and minority/women hiring are difficult areas in which to pose questions in field surveys or telephone interviews. Responses may be blanketly refused or may be colored by response bias or the need to project a socially-acceptable ("PC") image for a department, irrespective of realities. Indeed, departments with the poorest affirmative-action records may be prone to selectively "improve" them. In addition, error may creep in through such factors as poor recordkeeping, inaccessible records resulting from changes in departmental structure and/or administrators, inaccurate memories of newly appointed chairs or people on leave, or misdirected surveys filled out by assistants or colleagues. Nonetheless, this survey represents the best information gathered to date in the field of media communication.

Results

Over half of the 226 questionnaires that were mailed to BEA-member (and former member) schools were returned (115--a 51 percent return rate). Ninety percent of the responses were from 4-year colleges and universities, with only 10 percent from 2-year schools (in both the mailed survey and the telephone interviews).[7] The survey sample was roughly representative of the density of schools in the eastern (22%), midwestern (27%), far west (20%), and greater southern (31%) areas of the country. Exactly 80 percent of responding schools were public colleges and universities, and 20 percent were private.[8] Since overall college/university size was presumed to be a important variable, a quadripartite split of responding schools by size created a group of "smallest" schools with between 400 and 4500 students, a group of "medium-sized" schools with between 4501 and 11,000 students, a group of "large" schools with between 11,001 and 20,000 students, and a group of "very large" schools with between 20,001 and 94,000 students. A quadripartite split by number of majors produced the following groups: one quarter had between 20 and 150 majors; one quarter 160 and 260 majors; one quarter had between 270 and 450 majors; and the fourth quarter between 455 and 1,300 majors.[9]

At the 40 schools identified as nonrespondents for the telephone interviews, three chairs declined to be interviewed, because, they said, they lacked the time; one chair said he/she was too new to respond; and five chairs claimed they had already sent in the mailed questionnaire. At the remaining schools, the appropriate person could not be reached (out of town or calls not returned). A total of 13 interviews were completed in time for their results to be incorporated here.

Faculty Distribution

Altogether, the 115 schools responding to the mail survey had 1,273 full-time, tenure-track faculty.[10] Of those 7.8 percent were African-American (n=99), 2.4 percent were Hispanics (n=31), 1.7 percent were Asians (n=22), and 0.9 percent were Native-American or Pacific Islanders (n=12). Of the total full-time, tenure-track faculty, 32 percent were women (n=412) and 68 percent were men (n=861). The figure of nearly one-third (32 %) women faculty is substantially higher than the one-fifth (21%) calculated for the field in 1991 (Eastman & Leebron, 1992). *This suggests that there is a substantial pool of women job candidates and that the pool may be growing rapidly.*

The number of full-time, tenure-track faculty at responding colleges and universities ranged

from 1 to 38, with the most common number being 6. In addition, many schools reported having full-time staff and full- or part-time adjuncts who teach and contribute to racial, ethnic, and gender diversity.

For each of the four sizes of schools, Table 1 shows the percentage of schools with at least one African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and Native-American on the faculty and at least one woman on the faculty. For African-Americans and Hispanics, the numbers are remarkably consistent across sizes, although greater numbers of the very large universities clearly have substantially greater access to African-Americans and to Asians for their media communication faculties, while small colleges have somewhat less access to women faculty. However, *contrary to claims that small schools are unable to compete in hiring, this distribution suggests that colleges and universities of all sizes can and are finding ethnic minorities and women to hire.*

Table 1. **Distribution of Minority and Women Faculty by Institution Size**

	College/University Size*			
	Small N=26	Mid N=35	Large N=27	Very Large N=27
Racial/Ethnicity Distribution: Percentage of schools with				
African-American faculty	27	34	52	70
Hispanic faculty	15	14	22	33
Asian faculty**	4	14	11	44
Native Amer./Pacific Isl. faculty	4	14	19	0
Gender Distribution: Percentage of schools with				
Women faculty	73	86	100	93

* A quadripartite split of responding schools by size created the following categories: "Small" = 400-4500 students; "Midsized" = 4501-11,000 students; "Large" = 11,001-20,000 students; "Very Large" = 20,001-94,000 students.

**Inadvertently, the Asian grouping was omitted from the faculty distribution section of the questionnaire, but more than a dozen chairs added the information anyway to the quantitative section or in nearby open-ended-question spaces; it may, however, reflect an undercount of the percentage of Asian and Asian-American faculty at responding schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Over half of schools had not a single African-American faculty member, 79 percent reported no Hispanic faculty, and 12 percent had no women faculty in the department (and another 10 percent had only one women despite the large number of women graduating with Ph.D and MA/MS degrees in the last decade. And it might be thought likely that nonresponding schools possess even worse affirmative-action records than those who were willing to respond. For example, there were 169 total faculty at the 13 schools interviewed by telephone, and only 6 faculty (3%) were African-American and 53 faculty (31%) were women.

Policies and Commitment

One set of questions addressed the policies relating to affirmative action. Among responding schools, 92 percent reported that their college/university had formal, written affirmative-action guidelines, but only 21 percent said there were supplementary departmental guidelines. These proportions were confirmed in the telephone interviews: 92 percent had university guidelines, but only 23 percent had departmental guidelines. Table 2 shows that most schools surveyed are believed to monitor their guidelines very closely while most departments were reported (by their administrators) to pay "a lot of attention" to written and unwritten affirmative-action guidelines, and a nearly similar pattern appeared in the interviews. All schools contacted by telephone also reported that they followed "closely" or "very closely" their administrative guidelines. Whether a concern for political correctness influenced many responses cannot be know.

As Table 2 shows, in the mail survey commitment to hiring women was stronger than for hiring ethnic minorities. However, in the telephone surveys the greater strength at the department level was in hiring minorities. That may be an artifact of small sample size or suggestive of an underlying conflict.

One chair surveyed added this caution about formal policies:

> I am ambivalent about written guidelines and their 'enforcement.' I do think clearly defined policies and incentives are vital, but they can easily become bureaucratized shells of now-absent good intentions. There is no substitute for active leadership at the departmental level, in other words, the readiness to search actively. By 'leadership,' I include, of course, the ability to encourage active support where it is dormant, among peers and senior administrators.

Table 2. **Adherence/Attention/Commitment to Policy Guidelines**

University/college monitors adherence to affirmative-action guidelines	
"not closely"	6%
"somewhat closely"	37%
"very closely"	57%
Department faculty give affirmative-action guidelines	
"little attention"	11%
"some attention"	41%
"a lot of attention"	48%

	Minorities	Women
College/University commitment to hiring		
High	64%	77%
Mid	30%	19%
Low	6%	3%
Departmental commitment to hiring		
High	70%	82%
Mid	26%	13%
Low	4%	5%

A related set of questions asked respondents to rate their college/school and department on their commitment to hiring minority faculty and to hiring women faculty. Surprisingly, nearly two-thirds (64%) of ratings for colleges/universities were at the highest end of the scale indicating an extremely high level of commitment to hiring ethnic minorities among those surveyed; only 6 percent were judged to have low commitment (and the remainder fell in the middle). Commitment to hiring women was reported as even stronger (78%). For media departments, commitment to hiring ethnic minorities was judged to be at least as strong (70%) with only 3 percent judged as low in commitment to hiring minorities. For women, the case at the department level was again strong, with 82 percent reported as very high and only 4 percent as low. Again, the identical pattern appeared in the responses of those chairs interviewed.

These results contrast markedly with the actual underrepresentation of ethnic minorities and women appearing in the results from these same schools in Table 1. Of course, such reported

commitment may be more public relations than reality since the departmental chairs were classifying their own colleges/universities and departments. In addition, some doubt about faculty and administrative commitment to affirmative-action hiring is suggested by the widespread agreement on the reported problems schools face, irrespective of whether the schools are public or private and the region in which they are located. As should be expected, differences do appear between the very largest universities and the smaller schools (and probably between urban and rural schools although we did not gather that data).

Problems in Affirmative Action Implementation

Analysis of 404 identifications of the biggest problems and 381 identifications of the main reasons for success in hiring minorities and women led to some interesting contradictions. The most frequent response, by far, of departmental chairs at the sample of schools surveyed was that *the biggest problem in hiring ethnic minorities was the lack of "qualified" minority applicants.* The lack of "qualified" minority applicants was particularly reported as a problem for small and midsized schools, with the word "qualified" underlined repeatedly in comments by chairs at those schools commonly lacking minority faculty. Since the question asked only about a "shortage" of applicants, the respondents' frequent hand-written note of "qualified" is remarkable. It implies that minority applicants fail to meet criteria for advanced degrees, experiential background, or publication and teaching achievements, but may also refer to less objective criteria. In open-ended comments, respondents said their geographical location was a difficulty in getting suitable applicants when their school was rural or located in the South or situated in a city with a particularly racist reputation in the Northeast. Several chairs drew our attention specifically to the vital need for a support system for African-Americans or other ethnic minorities in the local community and in the rest of the university.

Most schools reported that there were plenty of women applicants, but not African-Americans and Hispanics or members of other minority groups. Several chairs mentioned that administrators must be prepared to pay a substantial salary premium to be successful in hiring ethnic minorities in a cultural environment without many other minorities. Among other special problems mentioned were the need for legal support from the university for the complex process of hiring a foreign national.

Most chairs seemed to think a lack of money was decisive: The second biggest problem identified was *noncompetitive salary offers*, especially at small schools competing with large state universities for the same applicants. One chair pointed out that the salary difference is often not a matter of $1,000 or $2,000 but of $5,000 or $10,000. Two chairs of midsized schools surveyed put it this way:

> The highly aggressive affirmative-action programs of our state universities are beyond our economic means. We cannot compete with them, and the small pool of minority applicants provides no additional candidates.
>
> My view is that there is a small pool of minorities available in any given year, and most schools cannot compete with the larger national universities for minority hiring.

A related problem was *the lack of college/university monetary incentives for hiring ethnic minorities and women.* Some schools have special funds above and beyond regular department salary budgets for initial (or longer term) minority or women hiring, but most small schools lack such an advantage. When the big state universities have aggressive affirmative-action programs, a small school nearby has difficulty competing. Similarly, the fourth problem reported was *a lack of administrative support for negotiating about academic rank for ethnic minorities and women based on criteria other than previous teaching experience.* Chairs seemed to think more flexibility in rank awarded at hiring could compensate for some other disadvantages.

Finally, the fifth most common problem reported was *an absence of agreement on targets for minority or women hiring* at the department level. (Disagreeing with the written responses, the chairs interviewed reported that the single biggest problem was either divisiveness among the faculty or the lack of monetary incentives in hiring.) In their open-ended comments, some chairs wrote about wide disagreement among factions in their faculties on the need for minority or women hires; they said that many colleagues did not see the need for minority or women faculty in their department. (Not surprisingly, many chairs reported that precise agreement on targets was one big reason for their success in hiring ethnic minorities and women.) A lack of agreement on targets points to the absence of wide commitment to a perceived need for minority faculty. These examples of written comments from chairs make the point:

> [The reason we made no hires is] the lack of perceived need by most of our faculty because highly competitive candidates applied and support existed from high above to hire.
>
> [In my department,] two faculty are convinced that affirmative action is

> dead and is reverse discrimination. Most of the faculty perceive the need for women and somewhat less so for minority faculty.
>
> For years, this was an all-male department [until] a department chair was hired from the outside because of internal department problems--I suspect the faculty would have preferred a male. [Our problem is that this is a] male dominated university in terms of administration and faculty. This is also the problem in most departments, including this one--which some still try to keep as an "old boys club."

A few other specific complaints drew attention to the problems of some schools: One was only receiving approval to search at the last minute; another was low department turnover. Another chair spoke for several when he/she protested about the general "passivity among search committees" and the "lack of proactive networking."

Although most schools reported that there were "plenty of women applicants," two departments brought up this problem:

> Problem is getting women tenured. Invariably, it comes down to women who rock the establishment and are voted out by the men. Compliant women, who go along with the male network, have a greater rate of success.

Another chair complained of the speed with which change is expected:

> People often fail to examine the extent to which attrition must be considered in diversity goals. Six years ago, there were several non-minority males in senior faculty positions. We cannot be expected to drum-them-out in order to improve diversity. However, as they retire, we have made important strides.

Reasons for Successes in Hiring

Contrasting with the most common reasons specified as problems, the two biggest reasons why their departments have been successful in hiring ethnic minorities and women are, according to 381 survey responses by chairs, *a perceived need for women faculty* and *a perceived need for minority faculty*. One chair reported that at her/his university, "If a female minority is on our short list, [she is] automatically moved to #1 and extended the position."

Closely behind the first reason in frequency of response was a reported *absence of racist and sexist attitudes* in the faculty. Also crucial to success, according to department chairs, was *a lack of divisiveness* among faculty subgroups. And finally, *the presence and enforcement of written guidelines or policies* was important. One chair pointed to the importance of "diversity recruitment programs initiated by college presidents." Interestingly, highly competitive salaries, monetary incentives, and the ability to negotiate rank were not among the most commonly chosen reasons for success in hiring,

while they were among the biggest complaints identified. In the telephone interviews, all chairs "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were satisfied with their departments' achievements in hiring women and minorities, despite the fact that most had no African-Americans among their faculties.

Many surveyed chairs claimed that success usually comes only through aggressive efforts. Stress was placed on personal efforts to attract applicants in the first place, followed by sustained efforts on the part of several faculty to get minority and women candidates included in the first cut, included in the group to be interviewed, and chosen for an offer. Also crucial, a few chairs noted, was making sure a minority or women applicant contacted other minorities or women faculty during the campus visit. Other respondents commented to the effect that having a strong department in an attractive location was a critical element in hiring success. Being located in a multicultural community in a big city was seen as a plus. One chair noted that "even $ can't buy quality of life." But for longer-term success, one chair gave this caveat: "It is vital that minority and women faculty be allowed to specialize in areas of their choice, like other faculty, and not be typecast by gender or ethnicity."

Searches and Hiring

Hiring is a multistage process that may advantage or disadvantage minorities and women at each of several steps. The first step is the search for applicants, a topic we addressed in interviews. Once applications are received, they must be sorted to select candidates to interview, and faculty perceptions of the importance of their need for minority and women faculty come in here. The fact that an applicant is apparently an ethnic minority (or a woman) may count positively as meeting one criterion if there is widespread agreement on that criterion. If agreement on the goal is lacking, then the gender or ethnic background of an application may be discounted (or even be a negative where sexist and racism are overt).

Who makes that initial decision? The construction of job advertisements, sorting of initial applications, and selection of job candidates to interview is usually handled in one of three ways: by the chair (with or without advice), by a tenure/personnel committee, or by a special search or hiring committee. At some large schools, a separate committee is formed for each position; at other schools (especially when position characteristics are flexible) one committee selects a large pool of potential candidates to interview out of which several positions may be filled. Especially at schools where

racism or sexism (by either the leadership or faculty factions) may be at issue, then whether a committee is used and how its members is are chosen become crucial matters.[11]

The initial selection process is also important at schools where economic considerations (usually for chairs) may outweigh any commitment to minority hiring. For example, chairs of departments with fixed salary budgets, who presume that minority applicants will only accept extraordinary salary offers, may be biased in selecting choosing who to interview. Such underlying presumptions can have a significant impact on hiring outcomes.

Table 3 shows the percentages of schools in each size grouping that have the initial selection of candidates done largely by chairs, by regular tenure/personnel committees, or by special committees. As can be seen, nearly three-quarters of schools create special hiring committees--typically one for each position--rather than use their regular tenure/personnel committees or delegating the job to the chair. What is disheartening is that *fully two-thirds (67%) of these special committees are appointed, not elected, and about 6 percent of such committees were reported to have no women members and 54 percent to have no minority members*. This is important because minorities and women usually bring specialized knowledge and interpretative ability to decision-making about other minority and women applicants.

If one or more minorities or women make the "first cut," the usual process (at large and very large schools) is to present the chair's or committee's recommendations to the full faculty for a vote on which applicants should be interviewed. At too many schools, however, respondents wrote in that this process is shortcut, and final decisions on who to interview rest with either the chair or the committee. If one or more minorities or women are asked to interview, they may, of course, refuse. If they are interviewed, the next step is the initial offer, a decision usually made after consultation with the full faculty. If an offer is made, it may go through iterations in negotiation of such matters as salary, rank, starting date, research and equipment support, travel support, and so on. But ultimately, the candidate receiving an offer must accept or reject.

Table 3. **Initial Decisions to Interview**

	College/University Size*				
	Small N=26	Mid N=35	Large N=27	Very Large N=27	Overall N=115
	Percentages				
Who recommends which applicants to interview?					
Chair	12	9	7	-	7%
Tenure/Personnel Committee	8	17	11	15	13%
Special Committee	65	74	70	85	74%
N.A.	15	-	12	-	6%
	100	100	100	100	
If a committee makes the recommendation, how is the committee constructed?					
Elected	8	29	26	41	26%
Appointed	77	69	60	56	65%
N.A.	15	2	14	3	9%
	100	100	100	100	

Applicants/Interviews/Offers/Acceptances

First of all, *13 percent of the 115 schools responding to the written survey had no faculty hires at all in the last 3 years* (the period relevant to the survey), and some reported having had none for as many as 6 or 7 years. (An even higher percentage--30 percent--of the chairs interviewed reported no hires for the last three years, and they were all at small schools.) For the 100 colleges/universities surveyed that did have advertised positions in media-communication departments during the preceding 3 years, we wanted to know how many jobs there were, who applied, who was interviewed, who got offers, and who accepted.

Table 4. **Minorities/Women Applying, Interviewed, Receiving Offers, Accepting Offers by Size of College/University**

	Colleges/Universities with Open Positions							
	22 Small		31 Midsized		23 Large		23 Very Large	
N of positions:	48		95		72		74	
Applicants	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Minorities	37	77	65	68	44	61	52	71
Women	42	88	83	87	48	67	70	95
Minority Women	16	33	38	40	20	28	27	36
N of People Interviewed:	144		239		129		205	
Interviews	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Minorities	22	15	52	22	38	29	65	32
Women	43	30	109	46	54	42	87	42
Minority Women	6	4	20	8	20	16	38	19
Offers made to Minorities & Women:	25	52	48	51	33	46	42	57
Offers accepted by minorities & women:	18	72	39	81	28	85	40	95

* A quadripartite split of responding schools by size created the following categories: "Small" = 400-4500 students; "Midsized" = 4501-11,000 students; "Large" = 11,001-20,000 students; "Very Large" = 20,001-94,000 students.

Table 4 reports on the 289 positions for which the chair provided written information on the pool of serious applicants, interviews, offers, and acceptance/refusals, subdivided by size of school. Specifically, the table reports (1) the number of positions available over the 3-year period, (2) the percentage of those positions for which one or more applicants were ethnic minorities or women, (3) the number of interviews conducted, (4) the percentage of those interviewees that were minorities or women, (5) the number of offers and the percentage of total advertised positions ultimately resulting in an offer to a minority or a women, and (6) the number of acceptance and the percentage of the offers that were accepted by a minority or a woman.

Analysis showed that *for about two-thirds of open faculty positions overall, there was at least one minority applicant, and that for better than four-fifths (84%) of open faculty positions overall, there was at least one woman applicant.* As should be expected, Table 4 shows that small schools had somewhat over half as many positions for which they could hire as midsized and larger schools. However, Table 4 makes clear that small schools had just as great a percentage of minorities and women (and that much-desired group, minority women) applying as the larger schools.

Looking at the percentages of minorities and women interviewed, the table shows that the smallest schools chose to interview fewer ethnic minorities and women (only 15 percent of the minorities and 30 percent of the women--in contrast to the very large schools interviewing 32 percent of minority applicants and 42 percent of women applicants). This reflects either the quality of applicants (as many chairs claimed) or the attitudes of the faculty toward possible colleagues as they winnowed their pools. It is apparent that <u>some</u> of the applicants at all schools were sufficiently qualified to interview. The final lines in the table reveal the crucial results: *all schools made roughly the same percentage of offers (46-57%) and all had more than 72 percent acceptances* (72 at the smallest schools up to 95 percent at the very largest schools).

In order to support or challenge these results, we undertook the same type of analysis by region of the country, by number of faculty, by public versus private schools, by college/university's reported level of attention to affirmative-action guidelines, and by the department's self-reported level of attention to guidelines. These are reported in Tables 5 through 7. Although there are minor differences, and some points worth noting, all these tables bolster the same conclusion: *All schools get minority and women applicants, and all schools get roughly the same percentage of acceptances of their offers to ethnic minorities and women.*

Table 5. **Applicants, Interviews, Receiving Offers, Accepting Offers by Geographic Region**

	Colleges/Universities in Each Region with Open Positions							
	28 Southern		22 Eastern		21 Western		27 Midwestern	
N of positions:	94		56		60		74	
Applicants	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Minorities	61	65	47	84	41	68	45	61
Women	79	84	50	89	42	70	68	92
Minority Women	33	35	28	50	20	33	18	24
N of People Interviewed:	239		163		119		188	
Interviews	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Minorities	58	24	38	23	27	23	54	29
Women	105	44	71	44	50	42	65	35
Minority Women	41	17	16	10	17	14	10	5
Offers made to Minorities & Women:	56	60	27	48	23	38	40	57
Offers accepted by minorities & women:	46	82	24	89	20	87	33	83

Table 5 shows a remarkable consistency with Table 4 in percentages of ethnic minority and women applicants, offers, and acceptances. It does show that the East gets somewhat more minority applications than other regions and that the West gets somewhat fewer women applicants, but the percentages of those applicants interviewed are remarkably consistent. Offers to minorities and women vary by region, with the highest percentage, surprisingly, going to the smallest schools--a contradiction to the claim that they fail to get qualified applicants.[12] Offers accepted by minorities

and women are extraordinarily consistent across geographic regions. One point of interest is that schools in the Midwest, East, and South appear to interview 2.5-3 candidates per slot, whereas in the far West, schools interview substantially fewer (just under 2), perhaps a function of distance and travel costs.

Table 6 reports the same type of analysis, this time using a tripartite split of numbers of tenure-track faculty members. This method created a set of 32 schools with small faculties of from 1 to 7 members, a set of 35 schools with midsized faculties from 8 to 13 members, and a set of 32 schools with large faculties from 14 to 38 members.

Table 6. **Minorities/Women Applying, Interviewed, Receiving Offers, Accepting Offers by Numbers of Media-Communication Faculty**

	Sizes of Media-Communication Faculties with Open Positions					
	Small Faculties 1-7 members N=32		Midsized Faculties 8-13 members N=35		Large Faculties 14-38 members N=32	
N of positions:	77		97		115	
Applicants	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Minorities	53	69	71	73	74	64
Women	58	75	91	94	94	82
Minority Women	21	27	35	36	45	39
N of People Interviewed:	187		246		284	
Interviews	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Minorities	38	20	70	28	69	24
Women	57	30	109	44	127	45
Minority Women	10	5	18	7	56	20
Offers made to Minorities & Women:	34	44	54	56	60	52
Offers accepted by minorities & women:	25	74	47	87	53	88

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

When analyzed in relation to the number of applicants, interviews, offers, and acceptances, the results (in Table 6) were generally consistent with the previous analyses, except for schools with small faculties. At those schools, about 10 percent fewer offers were made and about 10 percent fewer offers were accepted. However, offers were made in over two-fifths of positions (44 percent) and the percentage of acceptances was still near the three-quarters level (74 percent). *Thus, one can conclude, despite claims to the contrary, that any disadvantage to having a small faculty is very minor when it comes to gaining applicants, making offers, and receiving acceptances.*

Table 7 combines abbreviated versions of three analyses. The first (A) is of public and private schools in relation to the number/percentage of offers to and acceptances by ethnic minorities and women.[13] This section shows the typical pattern of around half the number of positions resulting in offers going to minorities or women. It also shows the typical pattern of a high level of acceptances, irrespective of whether the school is public or private. Section B shows the pattern we have seen throughout these analyses: about half of positions result in offers to minorities or women, and levels of acceptance are very high--86 percent for "some attention" and "much attention" schools.

Defining "Minorities"

A large numbers of chairs, particularly at schools lacking in minority faculty in our analysis, appeared uncertain about how ethnic minorities were defined at their colleges and universities. Above half (52%) left blank the question about their school's definition (or wrote in a question mark or said "uncertain"). Of the 48 who gave a definition, 6 vaguely said that the "federal definition" was theirs, an answer that may show a misunderstanding since the federal law leaves it open to schools to specify "protected minorities" relevant to their location and local population mix. In particular, Asians were considered a "minority" in faculty hiring at some schools, while in other places they apparently were not. In a wrenching twist, it was reported that at the historically black schools, non-African-Americans are considered "minorities." The chair of a eastern university made another point:

> Our student population is white and African-American. It takes a constant effort to remind them that the world isn't just black & white, and the argument that students should have role models of their own race is at odds with the need to show them other cultures outside their current experience.

Table 7. **Minorities/Women Receiving Offers and Accepting Positions by (A) Public/Private Schools, (B) College/University's Level of Attention to Enforcement of Affirmative-Action Guidelines, and (C) Department's Level of Attention to Guidelines**

A. Offers to and Acceptances by Minorities/Women at Public and Private Schools

	77 Public Schools		21 Private Schools	
N of Positions:	231		53	
Offers	N	%	N	%
To Minorities & Women	119	52	27	51
Acceptances By Minorities & Women	98	82	25	93

B. Offers to and Acceptances by Minorities/Women by Department's Attention to Affirmative-Action Guidelines

	Department's Attention Levels					
	9 Low Attention*		44 Some Attention		46 Much Attention	
N of Positions:	22		133		134	
Offers	N	%	N	%	N	%
To Minorities & Women	12	55	71	53	65	49
Acceptances By Minorities & Women	8	67	61	86	56	86

C. Offers to and Acceptances by Minorities/Women by College/University's Level of Attention to Enforcement of Guidelines

	School Attention Levels					
	3 Low Attention*		37 Some Attention		49 Much Attention	
N of Positions:	6		110		154	
Offers	N	%	N	%	N	%
To Minorities & Women	5	83	49	45	81	53
Acceptances By Minorities & Women	4	80	44	90	69	85

*Too few cases to interpret.

However, 42 (42%) gave specific definitions, typically including African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Asian-Americans, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, and Alaskan Natives. At 6 of the 42 schools, affirmative action policy referred only to African-Americans or just African-Americans and Hispanics. Three schools specifically included European nationals in their definition of ethnic minorities; 29 specifically excluded them. At 4 schools, the definition of "protected minorities" has been extended well beyond racial or ethnic considerations. For example, affirmative-action policies at those schools apply to Native Americans, Alaskan Natives, Asians, Pacific Islanders, African-Americans, Hispanics, Women, the Disabled, Vietnam-era Veterans, Special Disabled Veterans, Other Disabled Veterans, and in addition, discrimination is prohibited against "persons aged 40 and above and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals." In the telephone interviews, one chair reported that his school's policy included all "non-Caucasians."

The situations in California, New York, and Texas bring up unique considerations. One California school asserted that "preferences are now gone," while another asserted that they still gave preference to the "underrepresented in specific disciplines." In New York City, some schools include Italian-Americans as another protected group (along with the more usual ones, presumably), reflecting the city's particular heritage. But in Texas, schools had conflicting definitions of what constitutes a minority: At one very large university, "protected minorities" included American-born African-Americans and Hispanics from Mexico or Central America, whereas Asians and all other African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans were excluded. At another very large university, the definition reported was African-Americans, Latinos, Asian-Americans, and Native Americans. But a special problem connected with hiring Hispanics in states bordering Mexico was reported:

> Situated in the southwest, we even have difficulty with Hispanic candidates. Minority candidates have locally sponsored receptions when interviewing. For example, a local Hispanic organization will entertain one evening. But, if the candidate is from Cuba, South American, etc.--forget it. The local Hispanic group will want a Mexican-American to fill the job. There is considerable negative attitude toward "outside" candidates. This is both perplexing and amusing...certainly not expected.

Another topic that many, but not all, chairs seemed unclear about was the distinction between American ethnic groups and foreign nationals. Some schools, in the South and West for example, are committed to the hiring of Hispanic-Americans but not Mexicans, Spaniards, or South or Central Americans. Even at the largest universities--which can be expected to do the most minority hiring

and thus have the most need to consider applicable distinctions--very few chairs differentiated between African-Americans and African nationals or Asian-Americans and Asian nationals or Hispanic-Americans and Spanish-speaking nationals, although they are not usually treated the same under affirmative-action policies (or in incentive plans).

This raises the question of whether most chairs know what kind of graduate students and junior faculty to seek out as applicants. Although precise local definitions and exclusions can certainly be obtained from deans, provosts, or affirmative-action officers when an individual is under consideration, that seems very late in the search process. Moreover, a lack of familiarity with the issues during discussions in faculty meetings or in one-on-one discussions with applicants is a quiet signal of a low level of commitment to minority hiring. Highly informed chairs are more likely to inspire active searches for minority faculty (and women faculty) and more likely to present a sincerely welcoming face to actual applicants. As previous studies of minority hiring have shown, the subtle atmosphere of acceptance and welcome is at least as important as monetary considerations to successful hiring (Ryan & Martinson, 1996). Also important are having committee members who are people-oriented and who exercise a personal touch when keeping candidates informed of the progress of the search (Peirce & Bennett, 1990; Washington & Harvey, 1989).

Deans, provosts, and college presidents signal their real agendas by the information they present to and demand of departmental chairs. In numerous comments, chairs spoke of the crucial role of leadership at higher administrative levels. For some schools, a committed leadership brings active support in the form of money and other resources to departmental efforts; at others, lip-service was there, but positive leadership was absent or, worse, negated by the message being sent. Sadly, in his/her comments, one chair reported in some shock that in school-wide meetings of chairs the informal topic was "how to beat EEO."

Since a diversity of ethnicities can contribute positively to a teaching mission, the survey questionnaire asked chairs to mention faculty not included under affirmative action who, in their estimation, made a distinctive contribution to the diversity of the faculty. Chairs responded with 21 "ethnicities" that contributed: The only group that was mentioned more than twice was gay/lesbian (5 mentions), and otherwise the list of nationalities was wide-ranging--Bangladeshi, Belgian, British, Bulgarian, Canadian, Caribbean, Greek, Indian, Iranian, Italian, Middle Eastern, Palestinian, Polish, and Swedish--in addition to mentions of a Californian in the East, a Texan in the North, and a

European nun at a nonsectarian American state university. One chair commented: "We have a blind instructor who adds a whole new dimension!" Whether such responses were tongue-in-cheek is open to question.

Conclusions

The behavioral model being shown by media academics to students and the industry has little to commend it. Underrepresentation of ethnic minorities and women in the academic media communications field will not help alter the ethnic and gender imbalances in the professional world, and change seems to be coming excruciatingly slowly. The official promulgation of affirmative action policies do not seem to be changing departmental practices at many colleges and universities, and myths about the likelihood of finding and hiring ethnic minorities and women still drive the thinking of too many of our colleagues.

Four broad research questions guided this study. To provide a factual basis for discussion and interpretation, the first question addressed the current distribution of ethnic minorities and women as faculty in the media education field. Based on the 115 surveys that were returned, the data suggests that only very large departments of media/communications have been reasonably successful at minority hiring and that women also continue to be underrepresented at a large number of colleges and universities. Over half of the schools surveyed lacked a single African-American who was a full-time, tenure-track faculty member, and a startling 79 percent lacked an Hispanic faculty member. Such percentages are disheartening. Too often, it appears, ethnic minorities are relegated to part-time and adjunct positions--providing a rather spurious visibility for their departments and universities because they cannot then influence curricula and future hiring, may not contribute to undergraduate and graduate advising, and are left out of the mainstreams of departmental and campus power. For very small, rural schools, especially in the South, the problems inherent in minority hiring may be intractable over the short run. But since many colleges and universities of all sizes, support systems, and geographic locations have succeeded in hiring ethnic minorities, one is left with serious doubts about the commitment of the remaining schools.

The preponderance of chairs made clear in their remarks that a shortage of qualified women applicants was not a problem. Since the proportion of women faculty in the academic media field seems to have grown substantially in the last few years (from one-fifth to one-third in just five

years), there may be (a) larger numbers of women with doctorates available in the job pool or (b) schools may be choosing to hire more women. On the other hand, 12 percent of schools surveyed lacked a women faculty member and an additional 10 percent had only one women faculty member, despite the fact that most faculties consisted of about 6 people.

There is also the potential for divisiveness among faculties sharply divided by years in rank (translated age). The "old boys club" remains a powerful factor among older male faculty, whereas many young faculty aggressively argue for the widest possible diversity. The gap in culture and values may be nearly unbridgeable at some schools.

The second research question addressed the policies guiding affirmative-action in academic hiring and their enforcement. Although nearly all schools surveyed or interviewed had affirmative action guidelines in place at the college or university level (except in California), and most chairs claimed very strict administrative enforcement of those guidelines, few departments had taken the next step of reaffirming or expanding those guidelines as departmental policy. At some schools, the guidelines have turned into rigid bureaucratic procedures that have lost sight of the goal; enforcement thus becomes a measurement of procedure, not outcome. And at such schools, the guidelines too often degenerate into obstacles to bypass or meet with the minimum of energy expenditure. Too many departments leave affirmative-action decision-making to administrators, when it is only effective at the local level.

It becomes clear that some departments seek minority applicants for the mere sake of affirmative action reporting--to show administrators (and even colleagues) that they have made an effort to contact ethnic minorities by obtaining mailing lists, calling distant colleagues about their graduate students, and speaking to academic groups with ethnic minority membership. But many fail to pursue an aggressive course of action after this stage, but they can claim "they tried." Still other schools carry the process further and make sure to interview ethnic minorities for every position, but without real commitment to finding appropriate candidates, and thus they can claim, "We tried, but the person wasn't really qualified."

The third question asked about the correspondence between offers to and acceptances from ethnic minorities and women. Because chairs at many small colleges and universities have informally claimed that they make many offers to minorities and women that are turned down, we tracked the main steps of application, interviewing, offers, and acceptances in the process of tenure-track hiring.

We found no support for the claim of dramatically fewer minority applicants (or women applicants) by size of school, number of faculty, or region of the country. For most tenure-track positions advertised within the last three years, at least one ethnic minority and one woman applied. Although small schools have fewer openings on average and sometimes less turnover, when they do hire, most have a fair chance to compete for minority and women faculty. We found no support for the claim of "unqualified" minority job candidates since the percentage of applicants receiving offers remained consistent across sizes of schools, numbers of faculty, and regions of the country. We found little support for the claim of excessive numbers of refusals of offers at the smaller and midsized schools. Although the rate of acceptances of offers was somewhat greater at the larger schools (only by about 10 percent in some analyses), midsized schools and those with midsized faculties (with between 4501 and 11,000 students or 8-13 faculty) were on a par with the large and very large schools and large faculties, and even at the smallest schools fully three-quarters of candidates receiving offers accepted them.

Schools receiving, on average, fewer than one ethnic minority applicant for two-thirds of the positions they advertise and fewer than one woman applicant for every position they advertise are doing something wrong and should reconsider their search process. Such schools may have problems in where they advertise and what they advertise, but according to comments from the responding chairs, their problems more likely lie in (a) a lack of aggressive search for minority and women applicants and may lie (b) in the image of their school or community in the minds of potential applicants. Both of these problems can be addressed, although the second may be more intractable in the short run.

These results leave little doubt that the opinions and justifications reported by many faculty are either stereotypically prejudiced or are reprehensibly uninformed (for departmental chairs). And given that nearly half the chairs did not respond to the survey, despite repeated reminders, it is possible that their opinions are even more strongly prejudiced or uninformed. The chairs who recommend aggressive searches for applicants and aggressive support for those applicants throughout the selection and offer process are clearly on the right track. The damage done by presumptions of failure (or outright racial/ethnic/gender prejudice on the part of leadership) before the hiring process begins becomes incalculable. If chairs (and leaders of search committees) do not expect to find suitable minority or women applicants, they are highly unlikely to find them.

Finally, our questions addressed what can be done--and the possible solutions to the hiring problems. Not surprisingly, we found no admissions of outcome-based goals in higher education (using Francis's definition of concrete results measured in percentages), but we did find many suggestions for successful process-based strategies that can change hiring practices and thus outcomes. Of course, many factors affecting the hiring of ethnic minorities and women were not directly explored in this survey. Such factors as the degree of welcome in the interview atmosphere, the available support in the rest of the college or university and community, accuracy in advertising the position, and so on (see Ryan & Martinson, 1996), as were illustrated in some open-ended survey comments, will systematically impact actual successes in gaining applications, interviews, and acceptances. However, aggressive efforts to search out possible applicants and to persuade them to apply are clearly essential to success. And this initial step must be followed by active efforts to inform the rest of the faculty about the applicant's qualifications, including the special qualification of bringing a minority's (or women's) perspective to teaching, advising, service, and research. Convincing one's colleagues that diversity has value appears absolutely essential for positive hiring outcomes. When colleagues are convinced their need is great, the less tangible but no less important factors that affect the atmosphere of welcome, the communication of the unwritten job expectations, and the expression of the likelihood of collegial support naturally follow.

We concluded that the so-called "commitment" of administrators such as department chairs and higher-ups is far more public-relations talk than reality since too many bring little knowledge to hiring decision-making. If, indeed, aggressive solicitation of applicants is the first key to successful minority hiring, then too many chairs are appallingly ignorant about the kind of applicants they are looking for. Others must fight sexist and racist attitudes embedded in some colleagues in order to hire ethnic minorities, and when outnumbered or outgunned (or themselves part of the problem), chairs are rarely successful, even when they have support from higher administration. The keys to successful hiring appear to be aggressive searches, followed by persuasive arguments to colleagues (and administrators if need be) to include minorities and women among those interviewed and receiving offers. In addition, better definitions of who constitutes an ethnic minority for a particular department and what degree of need exists for representation of such faculty should be departmental concerns, not imposed administratively from above. Departmental faculty retreats on the topic of their diversity goals--or at a minimum, entire faculty meetings periodically devoted to

such topics can raise consciousness about the issues and eventually generate convergence of views. Complaining about the lack of incentives for minority hiring seems justified but fruitless in these days of retrenchment and budget downsizing, and faculties should push ahead without expectation of much monetary aid. We must hold ourselves to a high ethical standard even if it is not rewarded, and our students will benefit directly from increased diversity in the faculty, and the industry will benefit in the long run. It is when faculties stand together on the issue of diversity and actively undertake affirmative action on their own behalf that they can succeed and they have succeeded, as this report demonstrates.

Appendix A

Cover Letter

and

Affirmative Action Questionnaire

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
TELECOMMUNICATIONS

August 25, 1995

Department Chair
BEA Member School

Dear department chair:

The News, Research, Multicultural, and Gender Issues divisions of the Broadcast Education Association are surveying BEA-member schools to gather information about departmental affirmative action policies, practices, and outcomes. Although we want to collect information on how many minorities and women are on faculties in our field, that is not enough. While some schools have had marked successes in hiring minorities and women, at last year's BEA convention, faculty complained that too often they made offers to minorities in good faith only to have them turned down. That means records of actual hires are not a fair picture of efforts to hire.

As you know, some members of Congress seek to end federal affirmative-action policies based on ethnicity and gender. At the same time, some universities offer strong incentives for hiring minority faculty. In order to track eventual outcomes, it is necessary to know what current practices are. But a more important concern arises from the need for information on where the problems lie for departments in our field. We want to document the nature of affirmative-action guidelines and how strictly they have been followed, how many departments have attempted to hire minorities, and how many have succeeded. **We are interested in how you perceive the problems.**

One area of difficulty lies in varying definitions of "minorities." In this study, we focus on the largest groups--African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, along with "others"--and want you tell us if your university uses a different definition.

To keep the questionnaire short, we are focusing solely on the last three academic years--1992-93, 1993-94, and 1994-95. The information will provide a baseline for future research.

All information will be kept completely confidential; only composite results will be reported. We expect to disseminate our findings at the 1996 BEA convention.

Please return the questionnaire by **October 1**.

With our sincere thanks,

Susan Tyler Eastman, Indiana University

Clement Chow, Newberry College

Elizabeth Leebron, Temple University

Shu-Ling Everett, University of Colorado

Jannette L. Dates, Howard University

Radio-TV Center
Bloomington, Indiana
47405-6901

812-855-3828
Fax: 812-855-7955
E-Mail:
telecom@indiana.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AFFIRMATIVE-ACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Sponsored by the News, Research, Multicultural, and Gender Issues Divisions of BEA

Please respond to the following questions or fill in the requested information. Use the back of the page for comments and clarifications.

1. Does your university/college have formal written affirmative-action guidelines? YES NO Don't Know

2. Does your department have written supplementary guidelines? YES NO Don't Know

3. Rate how closely your university/college monitors adherence to those guidelines? (Circle one; skip if none)

not at all closely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very closely Don't Know

4. Rate how much attention your department's faculty pays to written or unwritten affirmative-action guidelines:

no attention 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 a lot of attention

5. Please consider all your full-time, tenure-track hires in the last 3 academic years.
How many of these positions did you fill in the 3 years of 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ____

For each position, answer the following (circle Yes or No, and fill in quantities):

1. Did the pool of serious applicants include minorities (African-American, Hispanics, Asians, or others)?
2. Did the pool of serious applicants include women? Were any also minorities?
3. How many candidates were interviewed?
4. How many of those interviewed candidates were minorities? Women? Both?
5. Did you make an offer to a minority or woman? Was it accepted?

Position #1:

1. Y N
2. Y N Y N
3. #= ____
4. #M=__ #W=__ #W&M=__
5. Y N Y N

Position #2:

1. Y N
2. Y N Y N
3. #= ____
4. #M=__ #W=__ #W&M=__
5. Y N Y N

Position #3:

1. Y N
2. Y N Y N
3. #= ____
4. #M=__ #W=__ #W&M=__
5. Y N Y N

Position #4:

1. Y N
2. Y N Y N
3. #= ____
4. #M=__ #W=__ #W&M=__
5. Y N Y N

Position #5:

1. Y N
2. Y N Y N
3. #= ____
4. #M=__ #W=__ #W&M=__
5. Y N Y N

Position #6:

1. Y N
2. Y N Y N
3. #= ____
4. #M=__ #W=__ #W&M=__
5. Y N Y N

Please add more positions on the back of the page as needed. Feel free to write additional comments to clarify the hiring process or situation at your school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. Rate your college or school overall on its commitment to hiring **minority faculty**:

poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good

7. Rate your own department's commitment to hiring **minority faculty**:

poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good

8. Rate your college or school overall on its commitment to hiring **women faculty**:

poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good

9. Rate your own department's commitment to hiring **women faculty**:

poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good

10. Rank order the **TOP FIVE PROBLEMS relating to affirmative action** in your department. Rate from those of **highest importance (5)** to **lowest importance (1)**. If none of the problem areas seem especially important to your situation, please explain on the back.

Lack of written guidelines or policies ____

Lack of enforcement of policies ____

Noncompetitive salary offers ____

Shortage of minority/women applicants ____

Lack of perceived need for minority faculty ____

Lack of perceived need for women faculty ____

Absence of agreement on targets for minority/women hiring at departmental level ____

Divisiveness among faculty subgroups ____

Lack of university/college monetary incentives for hiring minorities/women ____

Lack of university/college support for negotiating about academic rank for minorities/women based on criteria other than experience ____

Presence of racist/sexist attitudes among faculty ____

Other _____ ____

11. If your department has been reasonably successful in your view in hiring minorities and/or women, rank order the **TOP FIVE REASONS for your affirmative-action successes**. Rate from those of **highest importance (5)** to **lowest importance (1)**. If none of the problem areas seem especially important to your situation, please explain on the back.

Presence of written guidelines or policies ____

Presence of enforcement of policies ____

Highly competitive salary offers ____

Abundance of minority/women applicants ____

Perceived need for minority faculty ____

Perceived need for women faculty ____

Agreement on targets for minority/women hiring at departmental level ____

Lack of divisiveness among faculty subgroups ____

University/college monetary incentives for hiring minorities/women ____

University/college support for negotiating about academic rank for minorities/women based on criteria other than experience ____

Absence of racist/sexist attitudes among faculty ____

Other _____ ____

12. Describe the present minority/gender mix in your department:

Total number of faculty in September 1995: _____

No. of full-time, tenure-track faculty:	_____	No. that are women	_____
No. African-American faculty:	_____	No. that are women	_____
No. of Hispanic faculty:	_____	No. that are women	_____
No. of Native-American faculty:	_____	No. that are women	_____

13. Besides African-Americans, Hispanics, and Asians, faculty with other ethnic backgrounds--such as Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, Alaskan Natives, European nationals--may be counted separately at some schools. **Please define "minority" as it is utilized by your affirmative action program** (if any).

14. A diversity of ethnicities can contribute positively to a teaching mission. **Please describe any other faculty by ethnicity and gender who make a distinctive contribution to the diversity of your faculty.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

15. Who in your department makes the initial recommendations on which job candidates to interview, prior to any faculty vote? (Circle One)

Chair **Tenure/Personnel Committee** **Special Hiring Committee** **Other**

16. Is that person or committee **elected** or **appointed** ? (Circle one)

17. If you have a committee structure, describe its most recent composition.

Total No. of members ____ **No. of women** ____ **No. of minority** ____ **No committee**

18. Please estimate the number of **undergraduate majors** in your department. _____

19. Please estimate the **total number of students** at your college/university. _____

20. Is your college or university a **4-year** or **2-year** institution? (Circle one)

21 We would like your comments on issues related to affirmative action as it is currently practiced in your department. We assure you we will keep the origin of any comments **wholly confidential.**

Please return the completed questionnaire by mail or fax before **October 1, 1995** to:

Dr. Susan T. Eastman
Department of Telecommunications
Radio-TV Center 203
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
Fax: 813-855-7955

If you have questions or comments, telephone, fax, or email one of the following:

Clement Chow, Newberry College, phone 803-321-5218, fax 803-321-5232, "clemch@aol.com"
Susan Tyler Eastman, Indiana University, phone 812-332-2996, fax 812-855-7955, "eastman@indiana.edu"
Elizabeth Leebron, Temple University, phone 215-787-1837, fax 215-204-5280, "betsy@astro.ocis.temple.edu"
Shu-Ling Everett, University of Colorado, 303-492-8696, fax 303-492-0585, "everetts@spot.colorado.edu"
Jannette Dates, Howard University, phone 202-806-7694, fax 202-232-8305, "jandat@access.howard.edu"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

Interview Schedule

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Does your college/university have formal written affirmative action guidelines?
   YES NO DON'T KNOW

2. Does your department have formal written affirmative action guidelines?
   YES NO DON'T KNOW

3. On a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being not closely at all, rate how closely your university college monitors adherence to affirmative action guidelines
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very closely) don't know

4. On a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being not closely at all, rate how closely your university college monitors adherence to affirmative action guidelines.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (very closely) don't know

5. How many full-time tenure track hires have you made in the last three years?
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ___

6. On a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being poor, rate your college or school's commitment to hiring minority faculty.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (good) don't know

7. On a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being poor, rate your department's commitment to hiring minority faculty.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (good) don't know

8. On a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being poor, rate your college or school's commitment to hiring women faculty.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (good) don't know

9. On a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being poor, rate your department's to hiring women faculty.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (good) don't know

10. Are you satisfied with your department's achievement in hiring women and minorities?
    strongly agree agree don't know disagree strongly disagree

11. What do you consider to be the top few problems relating to affirmative action in your department?
    If we needed to prompt with examples, we used the following examples:
    - Lack of written guidelines or policies
    - Lack of enforcement of policies
    - Non-competitive salary offers
    - Shortage of women/minority applicants
    - Lack of perceived need for minority faculty
    - Lack of perceived need for women faculty
    - Divisiveness among faculty subgroups
    - Lack of college/university monetary incentives for hiring minorities/women
    - Lack of university/college support for negotiating academic rank for minorities/women based on criteria other than experience
    - Presence of racist/sexist attitudes among faculty

12. Using September 1995 numbers, describe the present minority/gender mix in your department total number of faculty.
    total number of faculty
    full-time tenure track faculty
        of those how many are women
    number of Hispanic faculty
        of those, how many are women
    number of native-American faculty
        of those, how many are women

13. Please define minority as it is utilized by your affirmative action program

14. In your department does the chair, a tenure/personnel committee, a special hiring committee or another group make the initial recommendation on which candidates to interview prior to any faculty vote?

15. Is that person or committee elected or appointed?

16. If you have a committee structure, how many members are on the most recent committee?

17. Of those members on the most recent committee, how many are women?

18. Of those members on the most recent committee, how many are minorities?

19. Approximately how many undergraduate majors are in your department?

20. Approximately how many students are enrolled at your college/university?

21. Is your institution a 4 year or two year one?

References

Adams, V.A. (1973). 'Affirmative action' you must take. *College Management, 8*(2), 28-30/40.

Applebome, P. (1993, Sept. 19). Goal unmet, Duke reveals perils in effort to increase black faculty. *New York Times*, p. 1.

Arneson, R. J. (1993). Preferential treatment versus purported meritocratic rights. In Cahn, S.M. (Ed.), *Affirmative action and the university: A philosophical inquiry* (pp. 157-164). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

American Association of University Professors. (1992). Diversity within adversity: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 1991-92. *Academe, 78*(2), 7-15.

Barbarita, J. (1982). Affirmative Action Guidelines. Discussed as Agenda Item Number 5 at the meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. San Francisco, CA.

Blackwell, J. E. (1988). Faculty Issues: The impact on minorities. *The Review of Higher Education, 11*(4), 417-434.

Basow, S., & Silberg, N. T. (1987). Student evaluation of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*(3), 308-314.

Bellas, M., & Reskin, B. F. (1994). On comparable worth. *Academe, 80*(5), 83-85.

Billard, L. (1993). A different path into print. *Academe, 79*(3), 28-29.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1975). *Making affirmative-action work in higher education: An analysis of institutional and federal policies with recommendations.* SAn Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Collins, R. W., & Johnson, J. A. (1988). One institution's success in increasing the number of minority faculty: A provost's perspective. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(1), 71-76.

Custred, G. (1995). What went wrong with affirmative action--and how we can mend it. *Academe, 81*(6), 11-17.

Dates, J. (1991). Multiculturalism and the Broadcast Education. *Feedback, 32*(3), 4-9.

D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus.* New York: Free Press.

Eastman, S. T., & Leebron, E. (1992). 1992 report on the status of women in the academic media field and the Broadcast Education Association. Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas.

Eastman, S. T., & Leebron, E. (1993). 1993 report on the status of women in the Broadcast Education Association. *Feedback, 34*(3), 8-12.

Eastman, S. T., & Leebron, E. (1994). 1994 report on the status of women in the Broadcast Education Association. *Feedback, 35*(2), 5-9.

Francis, L. P. (1993). In defense of affirmative action. In Cahn, S.M. (Ed.), *Affirmative action and the university: A philosophical inquiry* (pp. 9-47). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Jaschik, S. (1995). GOP presidential candidates bring out long knives when higher-education programs are on the table. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 41*(34), A28-A29.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Jones, T. (1995). The quest for convenient scapegoats and other foolish errands. *Academe, 81*(6), 11-17.

Kerner Commission Report. (1968). See the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

Leebron, E., & Eastman, S. T. (1995). 1995 report on the status of women in the Broadcast Education Association. *Feedback, 36*(3), 3-6.

Mercer, J. (1994). Assault on affirmative action. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 40*(28), A25, A30.

Milem, J. F., & Astin, H.S. (1993). The changing composition of the faculty: What does it really mean for diversity? *Change, 25*(2), 21-27.

Moody, C.D. Sr. (1988). Strategies for improving the representation of minority faculty in research universities. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(1), 77-90.

Morton, L. P. (1993). Minority and female representation plans at accredited schools. *Journalism Educator, 48*(1), 28-36.

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission). (1968). *Report of the national advisory commission on civil disorders.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc.

Olivas, M. A. (1993). The attack on affirmative action: Lives in parallel universes. *Change, 25*(2), 16-20.

Peirce, K., & Bennett, R. (1990). Interviewing potential faculty: Finding the right person. *Journalism Educator, 45*(3), 60-66.

Rada, J. A. (1995). Polishing the glass ceiling: Minority underrepresentation in media management. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Broadcast Education Association, Las Vegas, NE.

Reed, R. J. (1983). Affirmative action in higher education: Is it necessary? *Journal of Negro Education, 52*(3), 332-349.

Reed, R. J. (1986). Faculty diversity: An educational and moral imperative in search of institutional commitment. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 6*(4), 274-294.

Rubin, R. B., Whaley, M. A., Mitchell, N. E., & Sharp, K. (1984). Affirmative action on campus. *Academe, 70*(5), 24-30.

Rush, R. R. (1993). A systemic commitment to women in the academy: Barriers, harassment prevent 'being all that we can be.' *Journalism Educator, 48*(1), 71-79.

Ryan, M. (1993). Women's challenge to higher education. *Academe, 79*(3), 22-27.

Ryan, M., & Martinson, D. L. (1996). An analysis of faculty recruiting in schools and departments. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 50*(4), 4-12.

Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). *Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African-American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly white institutions.* Report No. 2. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Witt, S. L. (1990). *The pursuit of race and gender equity in American academe.* New York: Praeger.

Ziegler, D. (1991). Multiculturalism: An Opportunity for Educators. *Feedback, 32*(3), 2-4.

Notes

1. Rada cites the FCC 1993 *Broadcast and Cable Employment Report* covering the 146,629 total employees in the broadcast work force: 50.8 percent were white males; 39.6 percent were females as compared with 45.6 percent of women in the national work force. The combined minority employees (African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans) measured 18.2 percent while these same groups make up 22.6 percent of the national labor force. The disparity increased even more in the make-up of the only category not dominated by while males: sales workers, which were 45 percent white female and 42 percent white male.

2. Although it is common practice to double-count African-American and Hispanic-American women when they are interviewed, each individual is counted just once in hiring.

3. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972; Equal Pay Act of 1963 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act); and Executive Order 11246 as amended by 11375.

4. Two BEA-member schools located outside of the United States were not included because the relevant hiring and affirmative actions public policy and laws might differ considerably.

5. There were weaknesses in using the official *1992-93 BEA Directory* which was two years out-of-date at the time the study commenced. It also omitted departments of journalism and communications that did not identify with broadcast education. Therefore, it was supplemented by listings of schools from Sapolsky's *1994 Directory*. Although it contains fewer listings (just 28 two-year schools and just 146 4-year schools) than the *1992-93 BEA Directory* (59 2-year schools and 181 4-year schools), Sapolsky's data had newer telephone numbers and more recent data on the names of departmental chairs. In 1994, the BEA published only a listing of individual member's names, not the traditional by-school listings.

6. Telephone companies seem to take particular delight in changing institutional telephone numbers.

7. One "chair" operated in a state without tenure, at least at the community college level, and proved not to control much hiring, a condition that may be common at 2-year and very small schools and partially explain their low rate of response: "Difficult to answer questions. He responded, " When we as a college, hire new or part-time faculty and staff, I have participated when appointed to the committee. As program head, I make recommendations for adjunct faculty, and it is often difficult to find adjunct applicants who meet academic requirements to teach from the professional community. This state's community college system has contracts, not tenure. I don't really feel this questionnaire is applicable to what I do as program head."

8. This compares closely with 75 percent public schools and 25 percent private schools among nonresponding schools.

9. One chair reported 4,400 majors but that may have been for an entire school or college rather than just a media communication department. The exceptional wide range of departmental structures for media courses has been demonstrated in several previous studies, leaving a legacy of caution toward reported numbers of majors.

10. This demographic information was not collected in the telephone interviews.

11. It also matters in issues of promotion and tenuring, but those topics are beyond the scope of this study.

12. The West's significantly fewer offers to minorities is inexplicable unless it represents positions withdrawn after interviewing, perhaps for economic or public policy reasons.

13. Unfortunately, the number of offers and acceptances were not collected separately for minorities and for women because of lack of space and complexity of responses. The numbers and percentages can be expected to favor women over minorities as a general rule.

Abstract: This study proposed to learn about the hiring practices of departments of media communication. The questions asked were: · what is the current distribution of ethnic minorities and women in the media communication department; what policies guide affirmative-action in academic hiring in our field; do actual minorities and women hires accurately represent efforts to hire; and what can be done to improve ethnic and gender diversity in the media communication field. This study surveyed 226 chairs of departments of media communication on their experience in affirmative action in the hiring of full-time, tenure-track faculty members in the immediate past 3 academic years. Of the 115 respondents (51% return rate), ninety percent were from 4-year colleges and universities and only 10 percent from 2-year institutions. Of the 40 non-responding schools selected for telephone interviews, 13 complete interviews were conducted. Results of the study are illustrated in a number of tables. Some key results of this study are: there is a substantial pool of women job candidates and that the pool may be growing rapidly; contrary to claims that small schools are unable to compete in hiring, the distribution of minority and women faculty by institution size suggests that colleges and universities of all sizes are finding ethnic minorities and women to hire; the two biggest reasons why departments have been successful in hiring ethnic minorities and women are: a perceived need for women and minority faculty and the absence of racist and sexist attitudes in the faculty; all schools get minority and women applicants, and all schools get roughly the same percentage of acceptance of their offers to ethnic minorities and women. This study found successes in cases where the faculty stand together on the issue of diversity and actively undertake affirmative action on their own behalf. The authors conclude that the issue of diversity of the faculty lies with the department and it is important for the academic community to hold itself to a higher ethical standard, particularly in the current climate of retrenchment and budget downsizing.